IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE A.GOPAL REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 9214 of 2004

Between:
C.Madhusudhan Reddy, S/o Anantha Reddy,
3-4-114/17 A, Sai Chitra Nagar Colony, Ramanthapur, Uppal,
R.R.District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2 The Commissioner, Uppal Kalan Municipality, Ranga Reddy District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ or Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus by declaring the inaction of Respondents in not considering the representation dated 12-09-1998 submitted by Petitioner to Respondent No.2 for regularisation of construction made by the Petitioner, as illegal, arbitrary and against the principle of natural justice and consequently direct the Respondents not to demolish the present construction of the Petitioner's house bearing Municipal No.3-4-114/17 A,Sai Chitra Nagar Colony, Ramanthapur, Uppal, R.R.District.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.O.RAMESH (not present)

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: GP FOR MUNCIPAL ADMINISTRATION & URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Mr.R.TIMMA REDDY, STANDING COUNSEL FOR MUNICIPALITY.

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

None appeared for the petitioner. The only direction sought for by the petitioner is that the representation, dated 12-09-1998, made by him to the 2nd respondent for regularization of construction, has not been disposed of, should be directed to be disposed of.

Heard the learned counsel for the respondents.

Learned counsel for the respondents is not in a position to say whether the representation filed by the petitioner is disposed of or not. In view of the same, the 2nd respondent is directed to dispose of the said representation of the petitioner, if not already disposed of, and communicate a copy of the order passed thereon to the petitioner.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____

(A.GOPAL REDDY,J)

Dated:21..09..2004

GJ

To

1 The Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

2 The Commissioner, Uppal Kalan Municipality,
Ranga Reddy District.
3 Two C.Cs. to the Government Pleader for Municipal Administration and Urban Development, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad (OUT)
4 Two C.D. copies.